

With respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Babin, I would disagree and offer the following explanation and highlighted comparison.

I would say that the ultimate objectives of parts of Babin and myself are very similar to the point that they are essentially the same (the same as far as objective but not achievement of that objective). Both of us are trying to prevent roof loss in buildings subjected to high wind events, where differences in pressure may develop across a roof. There is however, a crucial subtlety between what our two different systems achieve and the design parameters that therefore go into achieving these objectives.

Babin uses a vent system to 'relieve' or 'release' or 'equalize' pressure. My vent system is designed specifically to 'limit' the pressure difference that can occur across a roof. This is a totally distinct and different objective. (See figs 1a and 1b which illustrate this in graph fashion)

Babin's system is simply an unspecified area of vents put in a roof to 'release' or 'relieve' or 'equalize' a pressure differential. This makes no attempt to place a limit on the pressure difference that can occur. Any hole in the roof, such as a chimney, bathroom vent or just a crack will achieve the same thing, a release of pressure. Release of pressure does not prevent roof loss. Only a limitation of pressure difference to a specified value will prevent roof loss.

My roof vent system is built to the parameters indicated by the equations that I have included. These equations link the worst-case scenario pressure change above a roof with the volume of the building to specify a vent system that has the area of venting required for that specific structure. The system only works/achieves its objective if it is built to these parameters. And it is a system, a roof vent system that achieves an objective that is different and distinct from the claims of Babin's system.

It is my understanding that the equations that I have put forward are not patentable, however their presence in my submission demonstrates a crucial fact. Without these or similar calculations you cannot build a roof vent system that limits the pressure difference across a roof. The system must be built based on the dictates of these equations in order to actually work. I have not found any previous art that demonstrates equations of this nature. It is an irrefutable fact of physics that in order to prevent roof loss due to a pressure differential across a roof, you must limit the pressure differential that can occur to a set value. Without this limitation you cannot prevent roof loss and without equations you cannot effect this limitation. Therefore absence of equations in the prior art is a tell tale sign that it does not and cannot achieve the same objectives as my invention. This is a further indication that my invention is new and cannot be encompassed by Babin. My system has and achieves a completely different objective. I have invented and designed a roof vent system that limits the pressure difference that can occur across a roof. Babin has invented a system that 'releases' or 'relieves' or 'equalizes' the pressure difference across a roof.